UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/595,686	12/27/2006	Jin Ho Choy	1751-405	4723	
6449 7590 11/10/2009 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER		
			LEE, REBECCA Y		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/10/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/595,686	CHOY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
REBECCA LEE	1793	

	REBECCA LEE	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the period	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) $oxed{oxed}$ They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		scied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		Inpliant Amendment (1 10L-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmen	at canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owable ii subifiilled iii a separale,	uniely nieu amenumei	it cancelling the
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-7,10 and 13</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	L NOT L II II II II II	PC 6 11	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.			ce pecause:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	P10/5B/08) Paper No(s). <u>09/16/09</u>	<u> </u>	
/Roy King/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended features change the scope of the finally rejected claims, and requires further search and consideration

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the amended feature of claims 1-2 change the scope of finally rejected claims which requires further search and consideration.

Applicant also argues the X-ray data of Tian, Boyle and Ren appear to be different compared to the instant invention. However, nonobviousness can not be shown by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the instant case, the rejection is based on the combination of Tian, Boyle and Ren, thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the X-ray data of Tian in view of Boyle and Ren would have a similar pattern as instant invention. Thus, applicant's argument is not convincing.